lets are anti-T.B. formulations. Waterbury's Compound (Red Label) has been treated as Category IV formulation. Other details as asked for have already been furnished in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 189 answered on 18th November, 1985.

Price of Protinex

1536. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) what is the price fixed for each pack of protinex and whether it is a fact that the prices have not been implemented so far;

(b) if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(c) whether it is a fact that it has been established that Pfizer do not have any Industrial Licence to produce Protinex;

(d) if so, what action has been taken against the company for unauthorised production;

(e) what was the production and sales turn over of Protinex during the last three years, year-wise;

(f) whether it is a fact that this company is overproducing vitamin products and underproducing essential drugs and formulations; and

(g) if so, what was the production of Vitamins, Tonics, Protein preparations as well as essential products falling under category I and II of DPCO, 1979 during the last three years year-wise?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) and (b) Price fixed for Protinex 150 gm. tin and 225 gm. tin inclusive of Excise duty under Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 is Rs. 10.56 and Rs. 17.07 respectively. M/s. Pfizer Ltd. have submitted a representation under Para 27 of the Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 and have not complied with the Government fixed price.

(c) and (d) An Inter Ministerial Committee which was set up in September, 1983 to go into this Question has since submitted its report. The committee has concluded that M/s. Pfizer were licensed to manufacture only bulk drug Proteine Hydrolysate and while they were producing this item, they have been manufacturing Proteinex without any industrial licence for it under the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951. Further action on the findings of the Committee is on.

(e) Information would be collected and laid on the table of the House.

(f) and (g) Companies tailor their production according to demand. Production of formulations is not monitored. However, this company complies with the ratio parametres prescribed under DPCO, 1979.

Unintended benefit on Refampicin

1537. SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to refer the answer to Unstarred Question 121 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 21st January, 1985 and state:

(a) what are the names of the drug companies whose records have been verified for working out the intended benefit made on Refampicin alongwith amount to be recovered from each;

(b) what is the amount so far recovered from each;

(c) whether it is a fact that crores of rupees have been made by formulators on this Anti-TB and Anti-Leprosy drug when Government exempted the custom and excise duty in order to make it available at cheap price;

(d) names of the companies whose records are still to be scrutinised and by when the same will be scrutinised;

(e) whether it is a fact that the companies have been making unintended profits since 1980;

(f) if so, what are the reasons for delay in the process of recovery as per control order; and

(g) by when Government propose to finalise the recovery from the formulators of this drug?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) Verification of records has so far been completed in the case of M/s. Lupin Laboratories, Alembic Chemical Works, Themis Chemicals Limited, Ranbaxy Laboratories Limited, Biochem Pharma and Lyka Laboratories.

(b) No amounts has so far been recovered from producers of Rifampicin formulations.

(c) and (e) to (g) The price of Rifampicin formulations were revised six times after 1980 so as to keep pace with the international prices. The excess amount, if any, recoverable under para 7(2) of the Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979 is yet to be quantified. Action is on to quantify the excess amounts in accordance with the due procedure of law.

(d) Scrutiny of the records of other companies like Albert David, Sarabhai Chemicals Limited, Ethico Drugs and Chemicals Mfg. Limited etc. has not yet been completed.

Imbalance of Ratio parametres in the production of bulk Drugs

1538. SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: Will the Minister of INDUSTRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the production of most of drug companies has risen disproportionately high as compared to their production of bulk drugs and by and large these companies are producing formulations far above ratio paraments;

(b) what is the ratio of production of bulk drugs to formulations of Abbott, Wyeth, Geoffary Manner, Warner Hindustan, Roche, Fairdeal Corporation, Smith Klin and French, Roussel, Park Davis, Glaxo, Duphar, E-Merck and Merk Sharp and Dhome during the last three years, year-wise;

(c) whether it is also a fact that drug companies are exceeding the production of Vitamin Preparations and discontinuing or producing essential medicines much below the permitted capacity; and

(d) if so, what steps Government propose to take to ensure that the drug companies produce the bulk drugs and correct the imbalance in ratio parametres within a specified period?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS AND PETROCHEMICALS (SHRI R. K. JAICHANDRA SINGH): (a) No Sir. By and large, drug companies are conforming to the ratio para-metres of the drug policy.

(b) Details of ratio of production of bulk drugs to formulations of companies referred to in the question to the extent available for the last 3 years, year-wise are given in the Statement (*See below*).

(c) Production of a Particular formulation depends on the market demand and corporate plan of the company.

(d) Fresh Industrial approval for the manufacture of formulations are being given only if the party satisfies ratio parametres.